

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-29 were pending in the present application when last examined. Claims 1-11 and 13-29 were rejected and claim 12 stands objected to, but includes “Allowable Subject Matter” and “would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims” (item 1 of the instant Action). Claims 1-11 and 13-29 are cancelled and claim 12 is amended as suggested by the Examiner. No claims are otherwise added, withdrawn or cancelled, and no new matter has been added. Therefore, upon entry of this amendment, which is respectfully requested, amended claim 12 will be pending.

#### **Objection to Claim 12**

On page 2, item 1 of the instant Action, the Examiner objects to claim 12 “as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims”. Applicants respectfully OBJECT in part, but thereafter comply with the Examiner’s suggestion in order to proceed with allowance of instant claim 12.

Applicants respectfully OBJECT that: (1) the Examination Summary at item 4 incorrectly indicates that NO claim 12 was pending in the Application when examined and (2) Detailed Action item 1 first asserts that claim 12 exists and is allowable (page 2, second para.) but later assertedly rejects claim 12 (page 3, first para.). Such indications appear to be mere scrivener’s error on the part of the Examiner. For example, the record clearly shows that claim 12 was in fact pending in the Application at the time of instant Action, and item 1 ADMITS that the subject matter of instant claim 12 exists and would be “Allowable” if compiled. Further, despite the item 1 (page 3) indication, NO specific rejection of claim 12 is provided, and specific rejection of instant claim 11 instead appears at item 1, page 7, last paragraph. Applicants therefore submit that instant claim 12 IS in fact pending and must presume that instant claim 12 does NOT stand rejected as indicated; rather, the minor contradictory indications were erroneously entered by way of inadvertent Examiner confusion with claim 11. Thus, claim 11 must stand rejected and claim 12 must stand objected to but not rejected as given above.

(Otherwise, claim 11 would be allowable on the one hand for lack of rejection and yet, on the other hand, rejected by way of specific rejection.)

Thus, in accordance with the aforementioned Examiner admission and mere scrivener's error, Applicants respectfully submit that instant claim 12 is amended herein in independent form and including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims". Specifically, unamended claim 12 is a pending dependent claim depending from dependent claim 10, which claim 10 further depends from independent claim 9. Claim 12 is therefore amended herein to include, in addition to its own limitations, the further limitations of claims 9 and 10, and "amended claim 12" now recites the following embodiment:

"12. A computer-implemented method of storing multiple tables for one or more tenants in a single data structure, comprising:

defining a data structure having a primary key column, an organization id column and a plurality of data columns;

defining a first table for a first tenant, said first table having a first data field, said first data field having a first data type, and said first tenant having a first tenant id;

assigning a first table id to the first table;

defining a second table for the first tenant, said second table having a second data field, said second data field having a second data type different from the first data type; and

assigning a second table id to the second table;

wherein when records are created for the first table, for each created record:

- a) storing the value of the first data field to a single data column in the data structure,
- b) storing the first tenant id in the organization id column, and
- c) storing the first table id to the primary key column;

wherein when records are created for the second table, for each created record:

- a) storing the value of the second data field to said single data column,
- b) storing the first tenant id in the organization id column, and
- c) storing the second table id to the primary key column;

wherein the first and second tables of the first tenant are stored in the data structure, and said single data column includes data values having said first and second data types;

defining a third table for a second tenant, said third table having a third data field, said third data field having a third data type, and said second tenant having a second tenant id; and

assigning a third table id to the third table;

wherein when records are created for the third table, for each created record:

- a) storing the value of the third data field to said single data column in the data structure;
- b) storing the second tenant id in the organization id column; and
- c) storing the third table id to the primary key column;

wherein the third table is stored in the data structure;

wherein said single data column includes data values having said first and second data types and said third data type;

wherein the first and second table ids are different; and

wherein the third table id is the same as one of the first and second table ids.”

Applicant has thus resolved the Examiner reporting error and amended pending claim 12 as suggested, pending allowance of amended claim 12. Formal removal of the erroneous rejection indication, withdrawal of the objection and early allowance of amended claim 12 are therefore respectfully requested.

**Rejection of claims 1-10, 12-29  
under 35 USC §103(a) over Lin i.v.o. Govind**

On page 3 of the instant Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-10 and 12-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 20050071345 (hereafter referred to as "Lin") in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2002 0174128 (hereafter referred to as "Govind"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 12 is made in error (or claim 11 is allowable for lack of rejection) for at least the reasons given above. Applicants further submit that Lin in view of Govind clearly does NOT render obvious either the rejected claims indicated in the introductory rejection paragraph or instant claim 11 for at least the reasons, which arguments are re-submitted for proper consideration. Applicants also submit that the Examiner's response to Applicants' Arguments is entirely deficient under at least 35 U.S.C. 103 and 37 CFR (see also at least MPEP 707.07) at least by merely stating a asserted conclusion with NO support and NO useful or substantive explanation (i.e., merely that the Examiner asserts that no combined argument at all is made, with which Applicants respectfully disagree). Applicants instead raised arguments that, while not specifically stated as such, showed how - *even assuming arguendo* that certain aspects *might* be held to correspond with the claimed embodiments - other aspects recited by the instant claims are nevertheless clearly NOT rendered obvious by the asserted portions or remainder of the individual *or combined* references. Moreover, and with all due respect, that the Examiner's support for combining the cited references ("because the two references are concerned with... data processing") is so broad as to improperly assert that most, if not all, data processing applications may *necessarily* be combined for 103 purposes, thereby also calling into question numerous issued patents.

Nevertheless, while Applicants might further develop the above and/or other arguments in a continuing application and/or by way of Appeal, it is Applicants' intent at this time to instead proceed with allowance of instant claim 12 in the current Application. As discussed above, the Examiner finds that instant claim 12 would be allowable if re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims,

and Applicants are therefore so amending instant claim 12 and cancelling the remaining pending claims 1-11 and 13-29. Applicants understand that the inconsistent and mere undeveloped indication of a further rejection of instant claim 12 is mere scrivener's error on the part of the Examiner, the Examiner's more consistent intent being to instead reject instant claim 11 (for which a specific rejection is instead provided), and Applicants are proceeding in accordance with such understanding. The rejection of instant claims is therefore rendered moot.


Withdrawal of the rejection and objection, and early allowance of instant claim 12 is therefore respectfully requested for at least the foregoing reasons.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that instant claim 12, which remains pending in the instant Application, is in a condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested. Townsend and Townsend and Crew, LLP is assisting the undersigned with filing this amendment and paying the extensions fees for mutual client salesforce.com, assignee of the present application.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-631-4232.

Respectfully submitted,



Daryl C. Josephson  
Reg. No. 37,365

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
GTG:sea